

Reinforcement learning for irreversible reinsurance problems: the randomized singular control approach

Zongxia Liang*

Xiaodong Luo[†]Xiang Yu[‡]

Abstract

This paper studies the continuous-time reinforcement learning for stochastic singular control with the application to an infinite-horizon irreversible reinsurance problems. The singular control is equivalently characterized as a pair of regions of time and the augmented states, called the singular control law. To encourage the exploration in the learning procedure, we propose a randomization method for the singular control laws, new to the literature, by considering an auxiliary singular control and entropy regularization. The exploratory singular control problem is formulated as a two-stage optimal control problem, where the time-inconsistency issue arises in the outer problem. In the specific model setup with known model coefficients, we provide the full characterization of the time-consistent equilibrium singular controls for the two-stage problem. Taking advantage of the solution structure, we can consider the proper parameterization of the randomized equilibrium policy and the value function when the model is unknown and further devise the actor-critic reinforcement learning algorithms. In the numerical experiment, we present the superior convergence of parameter iterations towards the true values based on the randomized equilibrium policy and illustrate how the exploration may advance the learning performance in the context of singular controls.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 93E20, 93B47, 49K45

Keywords: Irreversible reinsurance problem, singular control law, entropy regularization, time inconsistency, time-consistent equilibrium, continuous-time reinforcement learning

1 Introduction

Reinforcement Learning (RL), a paradigm of machine learning that allows an agent to learn the optimal decision by interacting with an unknown environment, has received an upsurge of developments in both theories and applications. Traditional RL has achieved remarkable success by modeling the trial-and-error decision-making in discrete time framework. While powerful, this discrete-time assumption is often a simplification of reality. Many real-world systems, particularly in finance, physics, and engineering, evolve continuously through time, where actions are not singular events but ongoing control policies. Recently, continuous-time reinforcement learning algorithms have attracted more attention and spurred a lot of new and fruitful theoretical advances. A series of pioneer studies such as Wang and Zhou [2020], Wang et al. [2020], Jia and Zhou [2022a], Jia and Zhou [2022b], Jia and Zhou [2023] lay the foundation for continuous-time exploratory

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, People's Republic of China (liangzongxia@tsinghua.edu.cn).

[†]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, People's Republic of China (luoxd21@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn).

[‡]Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Kowloon, Hong Kong (xiang.yu@polyu.edu.hk)

RL algorithms under entropy regularization from policy evaluation, policy gradient to q-learning algorithms. Later, more subsequent extensions of continuous-time RL algorithms under entropy regularization in various financial applications have been considered, see for instance, Dai et al. [2023a], Dai et al. [2023b], Jia [2024], Bo et al. [2025], Wei and Yu [2025], Wei et al. [2024], Wang et al. [2025], and the references therein.

Notably, the aforementioned studies only focus on the continuous-time framework of regular control policies, for which the entropy regularization can be defined in a straightforward manner. More recently, the optimal stopping problem has caught more attention motivated by many important financial applications in optimal hedging and option pricing. For instance, Dong [2024] proposed a randomization method of the stopping time by considering its intensity as a regular control for which the entropy regularization is employed. Dai et al. [2024b] considered the penalty approximation that leads to a regular control problem, and the entropy regularization is imposed on the regular control policy. As both studies transformed the optimal stopping problem into the regular control problem under entropy regularization, some previous results and algorithms such as martingale loss in exploratory optimal regular control problems in Jia and Zhou [2022a] and Jia and Zhou [2022b] can be adopted. Dianetti et al. [2024] considered the residual entropy on the probability that the agent stops before time t and formulated the randomization of the stopping time as a singular control problem, in which the Monte Carlo method is utilized to evaluate the value function and they obtained a policy improvement result in updating the boundary. Later, Dianetti et al. [2025] extended this randomization method and entropy regularization to learn the mean-field game of optimal stopping.

The existing study of RL algorithms for continuous-time singular control problems is rare. Noting the connection between some types of singular control and optimal stopping problems that has been discussed in some early studies, see Karatzas and Shreve [1984], Karatzas and Shreve [1985] and Karoui and Karatzas [1991], recently Dai et al. [2024b] transformed the optimal singular control problem of optimal investment with transaction cost into a Dynkin game of optimal stopping to learn the optimal strategy using the techniques developed in Dong [2024]. Liang et al. [2025] proposed a reinforcement learning framework for a class of singular control problems without entropy regularization by working with singular control laws and the established policy improvement on region iterations. How to achieve an appropriate randomization of the singular control using entropy regularization to facilitate the exploration in learning is still an interesting open problem in the literature.

Building upon the idea of learning the regions of singular control laws, this work aims to further consider the exploration in the learning procedure and formalize the randomization of singular control laws by introducing another auxiliary singular control law. However, we note that the entropy regularized singular control problem faces the issue of time-inconsistency, even for the case when the entropy term vanishes. The optimal solution of the original problem without regularization turns out to be the precommitted solutions of the entropy regularized problem. In our proposed formulation of entropy regularization to encourage the exploration, we need to learn the time-consistent equilibrium as a pair of singular control laws. To avoid some high technicalities in showing the existence of time-consistent equilibrium for the entropy regularized singular control problem, we choose to focus on a special model setup in irreversible reinsurance problems, for which we are able to characterize the unique time-consistent equilibrium in the analytical form. Thanks to the explicit structure of the equilibrium in the entropy regularized singular control problem, the value function of the original problem without regularization can also be learned.

It is also worth mentioning that the study of time-inconsistent singular control problems is relatively under-explored in the literature, and there are some emerging interesting studies until recently. Liang et al. [2024] introduced the notion of singular control law to define and solve

the equilibrium solution of an irreversible reinsurance problem where the value of singular control appears both in the dynamic and in the objective function. [Liang and Luo \[2025\]](#) applied the definition to a time-inconsistent Stackelberg game in reinsurance. [Dai et al. \[2024a\]](#) introduces a different notion of equilibrium definition in solving the time-inconsistent portfolio selection under transaction costs. [Cao et al. \[2025\]](#) exploited a similar definition to solve a new time-inconsistent dividend problem with a mean-variance objective.

The main contributions of the present paper are summarized as follows:

Firstly, we propose a novel method for the randomization of singular controls to encourage the exploration in RL. The randomized form involves two stages of choosing singular control laws. First, at each time t , the agent decides a singular control that represents the optimal strategy based on the learned knowledge up to the current time. This optimal singular control in the inner problem can be generated by a consistent family of singular control laws. Second, at each time of the outer problem, the agent flips a biased coin to randomly choose to act according to the current optimal singular control from then on, or to wait for a better time in the future. Similar to [Dianetti et al. \[2024\]](#) and [Dianetti et al. \[2025\]](#), we model the decision of the second step by an auxiliary singular control. The overall randomization is equivalent to a switch at a random activation time from the singular control law (Q, \emptyset) , which represents a pure waiting strategy, to a time-consistent singular control law.

Secondly, in a specific model stemming from the application in irreversible reinsurance, we connect the characterization of all time-consistent equilibrium singular control to an extend HJB variational inequality. By analyzing the variational inequality and some delicate computations, we obtain an analytical characterization of the equilibrium policy of the outer problem, which plays a crucial role in devising and implementing our RL algorithms. In particular, the vanishing regularization result does not hold in our time-inconsistent problem. We address this issue by performing policy evaluation indirectly to learn the environment, which is demonstrated to be valid by numerical experiments. For the auxiliary outer problem, the solution that represents the original problem’s optimal solution is actually the precommitted solution for any temperature λ , and it is not the limit of equilibrium solutions as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Thanks to the explicit characterization of solutions in both the entropy regularized problem as well as the original problem, we can learn the parameterized original problem by performing policy evaluation on related value functions as they share the same set of parameters during the learning procedure.

Thirdly, in the numerical implementation, the convergence issue on the iteration of time-consistent equilibrium policies might cause a trouble as the policy improvement result no longer holds. In general, it might be a challenge to show that the proposed iteration attains a contraction mapping for the fixed point. Again, by the merit of our analytical characterization of the equilibrium in the outer problem, we can show its representation using the value function of the inner time-consistent singular control problem, which enables us to only iterate the inner singular control laws and directly compute the iterated equilibrium policy for the outer problem by plugging the learned inner value function. Thanks to the established policy iteration convergence of the inner problem in [Liang et al. \[2025\]](#), we obtain the convergence of the policy iteration of the time-consistent equilibrium policies as well.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formulates the original irreversible reinsurance problem and introduces the two-stage entropy regularized problem for randomizing the singular control decision. Section 3 solves the inner optimization problem while Section 4 solves the outer problem with time-inconsistency. Section 5 is devoted to introducing the theoretical foundation of policy evaluation and policy iteration for our irreversible reinsurance problem. Finally, we implement and compare the performance of the exploratory RL algorithm using the randomized singular control laws and a benchmark non-randomized RL algorithm in Section 6.

2 Problem Formulation and Entropy Regularization for Randomized Singular Control Laws

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions. We consider the dynamic decision-making of an insurance company. The uncontrolled risk exposure of the company, denoted by X , follows the dynamics

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = \mu dt + \sigma dB_t, & t \in [0, +\infty), \\ X_{0-} = x_0, \end{cases}$$

where x_0 is the initial risk exposure, the drift $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and the volatility $\sigma > 0$ are constants but unknown to the decision maker. The insurance company can sign irreversible reinsurance contracts to mitigate the risk exposure. Using a singular control ξ to model the accumulated transferred risk exposure, we consider the controlled risk exposure X^ξ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^\xi = \mu dt + \sigma dB_t - d\xi_t, & t \in [0, +\infty), \\ X_{0-}^\xi = x_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

The insurance company has to balance the running cost from high levels of risk exposure and the cost of reinsurance. The objective for the insurance company is to minimize the following functional over all admissible reinsurance strategies of ξ , for $(x, t, y) \in \mathcal{Q} := \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,t,y} \left[\int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-t)} e^{aX_r^\xi} dr + \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-t)} c d\xi_r \right]. \quad (2.2)$$

In the above expression, we consider the exponential running cost with a constant rate $a > 0$. The exponential form represents extreme aversion to high levels of risk exposure. The cost for each unit of reinsurance is a known constant $c > 0$. The discount rate $\beta > 0$ is also known to the decision maker and assumed to be sufficiently large to satisfy $\beta > \mu a + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 a^2$.

In [Liang et al. \[2025\]](#), we develop a framework of reinforcement learning to learn the optimal singular control law without exploration. The current work aims to design an alternative reinforcement learning framework with randomized singular control laws.

In order to randomize the singular control, we introduce an additional decision on top of the singular control law at each time. Specifically, at each time r with state-time-control triple (X_r, r, ξ_r) , the agent makes the decision in two stages:

- (i) He chooses a singular control law Ξ_r that can be understood as the optimal one based on the information up to time r .
- (ii) Additionally, he flips a biased coin to decide whether to activate and act according to Ξ_r or remain inactive to wait for future information.

Remark 1. The idea of introducing an additional binary-choice decision is largely inspired by the recent research [Dong \[2024\]](#), [Dianetti et al. \[2024\]](#), [Dianetti et al. \[2025\]](#) on the randomization of stopping time in reinforcement learning. The intuition is that decisions in both stopping problems and singular control problems are irreversible.

This approach leads to a randomized singular control, with each trajectory being the trajectory of a singular control generated by some singular control law after some random stopping time. Mathematically speaking, we need to solve an optimization problem over a pair of $(\Xi = \{\Xi_r\}_{r \geq 0}, \eta = \{\eta_r\}_{r \geq 0})$, where Ξ_r is the optimal singular control law at time r that may possibly depend on the state-time-control triple at time r , and η is another auxiliary singular control with $\eta_{0-} = 0$

and $\eta_r \leq 1$ for any $r \geq 0$, representing the accumulated activated fraction of the population. Equivalently, under the strategy η , the agent chooses a random activation time τ^η after which she acts according to Ξ_{τ^η} , where τ^η is given below.

Definition 2.1 (Activation time of auxiliary singular control). Given any singular control η defined on $[t, +\infty)$ with $\eta_r \leq 1$ for any $r \geq t$, we define the activation time τ^η by

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^\eta \leq r) = \eta_r, \forall r \in [t, +\infty).$$

The pair of state and control processes under the randomized singular control law (Ξ, η) is denoted by $(X^{\Xi, \eta}, \xi^{\Xi, \eta}) = (X^{\Xi, \tau}, \xi^{\Xi, \tau})$, where $(X^{\Xi, r}, \xi^{\Xi, r})$ is defined for any $r \in [0, +\infty)$ as the solution to the Skorokhod reflection problem:

$$\begin{cases} dX_s^{\Xi, r} = \mu ds + \sigma dB_s - d\xi_s^{\Xi, r}, s \in [0, +\infty), \\ (X_s^{\Xi, r}, s, \xi_s^{\Xi, r}) \in \overline{W_s^\Xi}, \forall s \in [0, +\infty), \\ \xi_s^{\Xi, r} = y_0 + \int_0^s 1_{s' \geq r, (X_{s'-}^{\Xi, r}, s', \xi_{s'-}^{\Xi, r}) \notin W_s^\Xi} d\xi_{s'}^{\Xi, r}, s \in [0, +\infty), \\ X_0^{\Xi, r} = x_0. \end{cases}$$

Note that Ξ_r only affects the dynamics after time r . Therefore, we only consider the admissible set with Ξ_r being a partition of the region $\mathcal{Q}^r := \mathbb{R} \times [r, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$.

Remark 2. Equivalently, the pair of state and control $(X^{\Xi, \eta}, \xi^{\Xi, \eta})$ is generated by a randomized singular control law Ξ^{τ^η} given by $W^{\Xi^{\tau^\eta}} := W^\Xi \cup \{(x, t, y) | t < \tau^\eta\}$, or notationally

$$\Xi^{\tau^\eta} = \begin{cases} (\mathcal{Q}, \emptyset), & t < \tau^\eta, \\ (W^\Xi, (W^\Xi)^c), & t \geq \tau^\eta. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, our randomization on the singular control is equivalent to a randomization on the singular control law.

An entropy regularized objective function that relates to the original problem (2.2) is then defined in the following form:

$$\min_{(\Xi, \eta)} \mathbb{E}_{x_0, 0, y_0} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\beta r} e^{aX_r^{\Xi, \eta}} dr + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\beta r} c d\xi_r^{\Xi, \eta} - \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\beta r} \mathcal{E}(\eta_r) dr \right], \quad (2.3)$$

where the entropy function \mathcal{E} is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}(z) := z - z \ln(z), \forall z \in [0, 1].$$

and λ stands for the temperature parameter.

Remark 3. This newly-formulated problem involves time-inconsistency, even when $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. The optimal solution to the original problem is to activate immediately at the initial time. Noting that $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ is increasing in $[0, 1]$, one can verify that this optimal solution is actually the precommitted solution for the entropy regularized problem for any λ . It implies that we cannot encourage the exploration by using the precommitted solution. An alternative approach is to find a time-consistent equilibrium singular control law as the randomized policy to devise the reinforcement learning algorithms with the desired exploration effect.

Using the tower property, we rewrite the entropy regularized objective by

$$\min_{(\Xi, \eta)} \mathbb{E}_{x_0, 0, y_0} \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} I(x_0, 0, y_0, r; \Xi_r) d\eta_r - \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\beta r} \mathcal{E}(\eta_r) dr \right\}$$

where the inner objective function I is defined by

$$I(x, t, y, r; \Xi) := \mathbb{E}_{x, t, y} \left[\int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(s-t)} e^{aX_s^{\Xi, r}} ds + \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(s-t)} c d\xi_s^{\Xi, r} \right].$$

Now, the entropy regularized problem can be rewritten as a two-stage optimal control formulation in the following sense:

$$\min_{\eta} \mathbb{E}_{x_0, 0, y_0} \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} \min_{\Xi_r} I(x_0, 0, y_0, r; \Xi_r) d\eta_r - \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\beta r} \mathcal{E}(\eta_r) dr \right\}.$$

Recall that at each time r , the inner singular control law Ξ_r is a partition of state-time-control space $\mathcal{Q}^r = \mathbb{R} \times [r, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$. If this optimal Ξ_r^* intrinsically depends on the activation time r or depends on the initial state-time-control triple (x, t, y) , the issue of time-inconsistency arises in the optimal decision of $\{\Xi_r\}_{r \in [0, +\infty)}$. However, we will show in the next section that the inner singular control problem is time-consistent, albeit the outer optimal control problem over η is time-inconsistent.

3 Optimal Singular Control Laws for the Inner Problem

We first solve the inner problem to choose the optimal singular control law $\Xi(x, t, y, r)$, i.e., with fixed activation time r and for each initial status (x, t, y) , we find a singular law $\Xi^*(x, t, y, r)$ that minimizes $I(x, t, y, r; \Xi)$ over Ξ .

This problem may face time-inconsistency. At a future status $(X_{t+\Delta t}, t+\Delta t, \xi_{t+\Delta t})$, the optimal singular control law $\Xi^*(X_{t+\Delta t}, t+\Delta t, \xi_{t+\Delta t}, r)$ can be inconsistent with $\Xi^*(x, t, y, r)$. However, there will actually be no time-inconsistency because of the time-consistent feature of the optimal singular control law. It is usually the case that $\Xi^*(x, t, y, r)$ is independent of (x, t, y, r) by the variational inequalities of singular control problems.

For the inner optimal control problem, by the variational method and verification argument, the optimal singular control law $\Xi^* = \Xi^*(x, t, y, r)$ with the corresponding value function $U(x, t, y, r) := I(x, t, y, r; \Xi^*)$ are characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} e^{ax} - \beta U(x, t, y, r) + U_t(x, t, y, r) + \mu U_x(x, t, y, r) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 U_{xx}(x, t, y, r) &= 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, r), \\ \min \left\{ e^{ax} - \beta U(x, t, y, r) + U_t(x, t, y, r) + \mu U_x(x, t, y, r) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 U_{xx}(x, t, y, r), \right. \\ \left. c - U_x(x, t, y, r) + U_y(x, t, y, r) \right\} &= 0, \quad \forall t \in [r, +\infty) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$W^{\Xi^*(x, t, y, r)} = \{(x', t', y') \in \mathcal{Q}^r \mid c - U_x(x', t', y', r) + U_y(x', t', y', r) > 0\}.$$

Defining $\Phi(x, t, y)$ to be the solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \min \left\{ e^{ax} - \beta \Phi(x, t, y) + \Phi_t(x, t, y) + \mu \Phi_x(x, t, y) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \Phi_{xx}(x, t, y), \right. \\ \left. c - \Phi_x(x, t, y) + \Phi_y(x, t, y) \right\} &= 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty). \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Then, the inner optimal value function U satisfies

$$\begin{cases} e^{ax} - \beta U(x, t, y, r) + U_t(x, t, y, r) + \mu U_x(x, t, y, r) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 U_{xx}(x, t, y, r) = 0, & \forall t \in [0, r), \\ U(x, t, y, r) = \Phi(x, t, y), & \forall t \in [r, +\infty), \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

and the optimal $\Xi^*(x, t, y, r) = (W^{\Xi^*(x, t, y, r)}, (W^{\Xi^*(x, t, y, r)})^c)$ is given by

$$W^{\Xi^*(x, t, y, r)} = \{(x', t', y') \in \mathcal{Q}^r | c - \Phi_x(x', t', y') + \Phi_y(x', t', y') > 0\}.$$

It turns out that $\Xi^*(x, t, y, r)$ is in fact independent of all (x, t, y) , i.e., the optimal singular control law for the problems starting at different (x, t, y) turns out to be the same one. In other words, the sequence of optimal singular control laws is time-consistent.

Therefore, the time-consistent sequence of $\{\Xi_r^* = \Xi^*(x, t, y, r)\}_{r \geq 0}$ with each Ξ_r^* as a partition of $\mathcal{Q}^r \subset \mathcal{Q}$ can be presented by a singular control law Ξ^* partitioning \mathcal{Q} with

$$W^{\Xi^*} := \{(x, t, y) \in \mathcal{Q} | c - \Phi_x(x, t, y) + \Phi_y(x, t, y) > 0\}. \quad (3.3)$$

We next give the solution Φ to (3.1), the optimal inner strategy Ξ^* of the form (3.3) and solution U to (3.2) all in explicit form.

By observing the independence of the PDE (3.1) on variables t and y , we obtain $\Phi(x, t, y) = \Phi(x)$ with

$$\Phi(x) = \begin{cases} C_a e^{ax} + C_b e^{bx}, & x < \hat{x}, \\ c(x - \hat{x}) + C_a e^{a\hat{x}} + C_b e^{b\hat{x}}, & x \geq \hat{x} \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b &:= \frac{\sqrt{\mu^2 + 2\beta\sigma^2} - \mu}{\sigma^2} > a, \\ \hat{x} &:= \frac{1}{a} \ln\left(\frac{bc(\beta - \mu a - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 a^2)}{ba - a^2}\right), \\ C_a &:= \frac{1}{\beta - \mu a - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 a^2}, \\ C_b &:= -\frac{a^2}{b^2(\beta - \mu a - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 a^2)} e^{(a-b)\hat{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the optimal inner strategy Ξ^* is explicitly given by

$$W^{\Xi^*} = \{(x, t, y) \in \mathcal{Q} | x > \hat{x}\}. \quad (3.5)$$

Observing the independence of (3.2) on variable y , we have $U(x, t, y, r) = U(x, t, r) := U^r(x, t)$ with U^r solving

$$\begin{cases} e^{ax} - \beta U^r(x, t) + \mathcal{A}U^r(x, t) = 0, & \forall t \in [0, r), \\ U^r(x, t) = \Phi(x), & \forall t \in [r, \infty), \end{cases}$$

which can be considered as a terminal value problem in $[0, r]$.

Note that $C_a e^{ax}$ solves

$$e^{ax} - \beta U^r(x, t) + \mathcal{A}U^r(x, t) = 0$$

as an equation of U^r . By the Feynman–Kac formula, the solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\beta U^r(x, t) + \mathcal{A}U^r(x, t) = 0, & \forall t \in [0, r), \\ U^r(x, r) = \Phi(x) - C_a e^{ax}, \end{cases},$$

is given by

$$e^{-\beta(r-t)} \mathbb{E}_{x,t} [\Phi(X_r) - C_a e^{aX_r}] \quad (3.6)$$

where $X_r = x + \mu(r-t) + \sigma B_{r-t}$.

Hence we obtain

$$U^r(x, t) = C_a e^{ax} + e^{-\beta(r-t)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2(r-t)}} e^{-\frac{[y-x-\mu(r-t)]^2}{2\sigma^2(r-t)}} [\Phi(y) - C_a e^{ay}] dy.$$

One can observe that $U(x, t, r)$ depends on t, r only through $r-t$, i.e., $U(x, t, r) = \Psi(x, r-t)$ where

$$\Psi(p, q) := C_a e^{ap} + e^{-\beta q} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(y, p, q) [\Phi(y) - C_a e^{ay}] dy, \forall (p, q) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty).$$

with

$$G(y, p, q) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2 q}} e^{-\frac{[y-p-\mu q]^2}{2\sigma^2 q}}.$$

We have the following useful lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ function $\tilde{F}(y)$, we have the expansion at $q \downarrow 0$ that*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(y, p, q) \tilde{F}(y) dy = \tilde{F}(p) + [\mu \tilde{F}'(p) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \tilde{F}''(p)] q + o(q).$$

Proof. Define the process $Y = \{Y_r\}_{r \geq 0}$ by

$$dY_r = \mu dr + \sigma dB_r, \quad r \geq 0,$$

with $Y_0 = p$. Then $Y_q \sim N(p + \mu q, \sigma^2 q)$ for any $q > 0$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_{Y_0=p} [\tilde{F}(Y_q)] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(y, p, q) \tilde{F}(y) dy.$$

Itô's formula yields that

$$d\tilde{F}(Y_r) = \left[\mu \tilde{F}'(Y_r) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \tilde{F}''(Y_r) \right] dr + \sigma \tilde{F}'(Y_r) dB_r.$$

For q sufficiently small, integrating the last formula over $r \in [0, q]$ and taking expectations yield the desired result. \square

4 Time-Consistent Equilibrium Singular Control for the Outer Problem

We next tackle the outer problem:

$$\min_{\eta} \mathbb{E}_{x_0, 0, 0} \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} U(x_0, 0, r) d\eta_r - \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\beta r} \mathcal{E}(\eta_r) dr \right\},$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{x,t,z}$ stands for the conditional expectation given $X_{t-} = x, \eta_{t-} = z$. From the analysis in the last section, η_r represents the fraction of the population that has followed the singular control law Ξ^* up to time r . We also call η_r the activated fraction of the population up to time r .

At an arbitrary future time t , suppose the activated fraction at t is $z \in [0, 1]$, i.e., $\eta_{t-} = z$, then the agent should choose a strategy $\{\eta_s\}_{s \in [t, +\infty)}$ to control the remaining $1 - z$ fraction of population that have not activated before time t . Therefore, the outer problem at time t is to minimizing over $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{t,z}$ under the objective functional:

$$J(x, t, z; \eta) := \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ \int_t^{+\infty} U(X_t, t, r) d\eta_r - \lambda \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-t)} \mathcal{E}(\eta_r) dr \right\}, \forall (x, t, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty) \times [0, 1]. \quad (4.1)$$

where X is the uncontrolled state process governed by

$$\begin{cases} dX_r = \mu dr + \sigma dB_r, \forall r \in [t, +\infty), \\ X_t = x. \end{cases}$$

The admissible set $\mathcal{D}_{t,z}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{t,z} := \{ \eta = \{\eta_s\}_{s \in [t, +\infty)} \mid \eta \text{ is non-decreasing and càdlàg} \\ \text{with } \eta_{t-} = z \text{ and } \eta_{(t+h)-} - \eta_t = O(h), \forall t \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Because of the dependence of the integrand U on X_t and t , the problem is time-inconsistent and the dynamic programming principle does not hold. The problem is a finite-fuel type time-inconsistent singular control problem where the time-inconsistency is due to the dependence of the initial states. We then look for a time-consistent equilibrium singular control law η .

Definition 4.1 (Admissible auxiliary singular control law). Suppose $\Upsilon = (\mathcal{W}^\Upsilon, (\mathcal{W}^\Upsilon)^c)$ is a partition of

$$\mathcal{R} := \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty) \times [0, 1].$$

We call Υ an *admissible auxiliary singular control law* if

$$(x, t, 1) \in \mathcal{W}^\Upsilon, \forall (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty) \quad (4.2)$$

and for any $(x, t, z) \in \mathcal{R}$, the Skorohod reflection problem

$$\begin{cases} dX_r = \mu dr + \sigma dB_r, \forall r \in [t, +\infty), \\ (X_r, r, \eta_r^\Upsilon) \in \overline{\mathcal{W}^\Upsilon}, \forall r \in [t, +\infty), \\ \eta_r^\Upsilon = z + \int_t^r 1_{(X_{r'-}, r', \eta_{r'-}^\Upsilon) \notin \mathcal{W}^\Upsilon} d\eta_{r'}^\Upsilon, \forall r \in [t, +\infty), \\ X_{t-} = x. \end{cases}$$

has a unique strong solution $\eta^\Upsilon := \eta^{x,t,z,\Upsilon}$. We call $\eta^\Upsilon := \eta^{x,t,z,\Upsilon}$ the auxiliary singular control generated by Υ at (x, t, z) .

Remark 4. Due to the independence of the state process X on η , one can easily show that a division of Υ is admissible if and only if (4.2) holds. Moreover, η^Υ has the explicit expression

$$\eta_r^{x,t,z,\Upsilon} = z + \sup_{s \in [t, r]} \inf \{ a \geq 0 \mid (X_s, s, z + a) \in \overline{\mathcal{W}^\Upsilon} \}.$$

Definition 4.2 (Equilibrium auxiliary singular control law). Suppose $\hat{\Upsilon}$ is an admissible auxiliary singular control law. We call $\hat{\Upsilon}$ an *equilibrium auxiliary singular control law* and $J(x, t, z; \eta^{x,t,z,\hat{\Upsilon}})$ the corresponding equilibrium value function at (x, t, z) if for any initial (x, t, z) , any $\eta' \in \mathcal{D}_{t,z}$, it holds that

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{J(x, t, z; \eta^h) - J(x, t, z; \eta^{x,t,z,\hat{\Upsilon}})}{h} \geq 0$$

where $\eta^h, h \in (0, +\infty)$, is defined by

$$\eta_r^h = \begin{cases} \eta_r', & r \in [t, t+h), \\ \eta_r^{X_{(t+h)-}, t+h, \eta_{(t+h)-}', \hat{\Upsilon}}, & r \in [t+h, +\infty). \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

We have the following verification theorem to characterize the time-consistent equilibrium.

Theorem 4.3 (Verification theorem of the outer problem). *Given function $V(x, t, z)$ and a family of functions $\{f^{p,s}(x, t, z)\}_{(p,s) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty)}$, define $f(x, t, z, p, s) := f^{p,s}(x, t, z)$ and define the infinitesimal operator*

$$\mathcal{A}\varphi(x, t, z) := \varphi_t(x, t, z) + \mu\varphi_x(x, t, z) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\varphi_{xx}(x, t, z),$$

and define $\hat{\Upsilon}$ by considering

$$\mathcal{W}^{\Upsilon} := \{(x, t, z) \in \mathcal{R} | U(x, t, t) + V_z(x, t, z) = 0\}.$$

Then $\hat{\Upsilon}$ is an equilibrium auxiliary singular control law and $V(x, t, z)$ is the corresponding equilibrium value function at (x, t, z) if the following properties hold.

(a) $V, f^{p,s}, (x, t, z) \mapsto f(x, t, z, x, t)$ are all in $C^{2,1,1}(\mathcal{R})$.

(b) The following extended HJB system holds

$$\min\{-\lambda\mathcal{E}(z) + \mathcal{A}V(x, t, z) - \mathcal{A}f(x, t, z, x, t) + (\mathcal{A}f^{x,t})(x, t, z), U(x, t, t) + V_z(x, t, z)\} = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

$$-\lambda e^{-\beta(t-s)}\mathcal{E}(z) + (\mathcal{A}f^{p,s})(x, t, z) = 0, \forall (x, t, z) \in \mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}}, \quad (4.5)$$

$$U(p, s, t) + f_z^{p,s}(x, t, z) = 0, \forall (x, t, z) \notin \mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}}. \quad (4.6)$$

(c) $\hat{\Upsilon}$ is admissible.

(d) For $\varphi = V, f^{p,s}, (x, t, z) \mapsto f(x, t, z, x, t)$, $\eta' \in \mathcal{D}_{t,z}$ and any $T > t$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \int_t^T \varphi_x^2(X_r, r, \eta_r') dr < \infty.$$

(e) For $\varphi = V, f^{p,s}, (x, t, z) \mapsto f(x, t, z, x, t)$, any initial $(x, t, z) \in \mathcal{R}$ and any admissible $\eta' \in \mathcal{D}_{t,z}$, the transversality condition holds that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \varphi(X_T, T, \eta_T') = 0.$$

Moreover, $f^{p,s}$ has the probabilistic representation

$$f^{p,s}(x, t, z) = \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ \int_t^{+\infty} U(p, s, r) d\hat{\eta}_r - \lambda \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\hat{\eta}_r) dr \right\}. \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. For the fixed initial value $(x, t, z) \in \mathcal{R}$, we denote $\hat{\eta} = \eta^{x,t,z,\hat{\Upsilon}}$.

Step 1: We show that f has the probability representation (4.7). Applying Itô-Tanaka-Meyer's formula to $f^{p,s}(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & f^{p,s}(X_{T-}, T, \hat{\eta}_{T-}) - f^{p,s}(x, t, z) \\ &= \int_t^T (\mathcal{A}f^{p,s})(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r) dr + \int_t^T \sigma f_x^{p,s}(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r) dB_r \\ &+ \int_t^T f_z^{p,s}(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r) d\hat{\eta}_r^c + \sum_{r \in [t, T)} \int_0^{\Delta \hat{\eta}_r} f_z^{p,s}(X_r, r, \eta_{r-} + u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations, letting $T \rightarrow +\infty$ and applying (4.5) and (4.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f^{p,s}(x, t, z) &= \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left[- \int_t^{+\infty} \lambda e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\hat{\eta}_r) dr + \int_t^{+\infty} U(p, s, r) d\hat{\eta}_r^c + \sum_{r \in [t, +\infty)} \int_0^{\Delta \hat{\eta}_r} U(p, s, r) du \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left[- \int_t^{+\infty} \lambda e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\hat{\eta}_r) dr + \int_t^{+\infty} U(p, s, r) d\hat{\eta}_r \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: We prove that $V(x, t, z) = f(x, t, z, x, t) = J(x, t, z; \hat{\eta})$. Applying Itô-Tanaka-Meyer's formula to $V(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r)$ and $f(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}, X_r, r)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &V(X_{T-}, T, \hat{\eta}_{T-}) - V(x, t, z) \\ &= \int_t^T (\mathcal{A}V)(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r) dr + \int_t^T \sigma V(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r) dB_r \\ &\quad + \int_t^T V_z(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r) d\hat{\eta}_r^c + \sum_{r \in [t, T)} \int_0^{\Delta \hat{\eta}_r} V_z(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_{r-} + u) du \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &f(X_{T-}, T, \hat{\eta}_{T-}, X_{T-}, T) - f(x, t, z, x, t) \\ &= \int_t^T \mathcal{A}f(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r, X_r, r) dr + \int_t^T \sigma f(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r, X_r, r) dB_r \\ &\quad + \int_t^T f_z(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_r, X_r, r) d\hat{\eta}_r^c + \sum_{r \in [t, T)} \int_0^{\Delta \hat{\eta}_r} f_z(X_r, r, \hat{\eta}_{r-} + u, X_r, r) du. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

By comparing (4.4), (4.5) and (4.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}V(x, t, z) &= \mathcal{A}f(x, t, z, x, t), \forall (x, t, z) \in \mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}}, \\ V_z(x, t, z) &= f_z^{t,z}(x, t, z), \forall (x, t, z) \notin \mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations on both sides of (4.8) and (4.9), letting $T \rightarrow +\infty$, and plugging in the last two equations, we obtain that

$$V(x, t, z) = f(x, t, z, x, t).$$

Thanks to (4.7), we obtain

$$V(x, t, z) = f(x, t, z, x, t) = J(x, t, z; \hat{\Upsilon}).$$

Step 3: We show that $\hat{\Upsilon}$ is an equilibrium auxiliary singular control law. For any (t, z) and $\eta' \in \mathcal{D}_{t,z}$, define

$$f^{\eta'}(x, t, z, p, s) = \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ \int_t^{+\infty} U(p, s, r) d\eta'_r - \lambda \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\eta'_r) dr \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\eta^h}(x, t, z, x, t) &= \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ f^{\eta^h}(X_{(t+h)-}, t+h, \eta'_{(t+h)-}, x, t) - \int_t^{t+h} \lambda e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\eta'_r) dr \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_t^{t+h} U(x, t, r) d(\eta')_r^c + \sum_{r \in [t, t+h)} U(x, t, r) \Delta \eta'_r \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $f^{\eta^h}(X_{(t+h)-}, t+h, \eta'_{(t+h)-}, x, t) = f(X_{(t+h)-}, t+h, \eta'_{(t+h)-}, x, t)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& J(x, t, z; \eta^h) - J(x, t, z; \hat{\eta}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ f(X_{(t+h)-}, t+h, \eta'_{(t+h)-}, x, t) - f(x, t, z, x, t) - \int_t^{t+h} \lambda e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\eta'_r) dr \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_t^{t+h} U(x, t, r) d(\eta'_r)^c + \sum_{r \in [t, t+h)} U(x, t, r) \Delta \eta'_r \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ \int_t^{t+h} (\mathcal{A}f^{x,t})(X_r, r, \eta'_r) dr + \int_t^{t+h} f_z^{x,t}(X_r, r, \eta'_r) d(\eta'_r)^c + \sum_{r \in [t, t+h)} \int_0^{\Delta \eta'_r} f_z^{x,t}(X_r, r, \eta'_{r-} + u) du \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_t^{t+h} \lambda e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\eta'_r) dr + \int_t^{t+h} U(x, t, r) d(\eta'_r)^c + \sum_{r \in [t, t+h)} U(x, t, r) \Delta \eta'_r \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain that

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{J(x, t, z; \eta^h) - J(x, t, z; \hat{\eta})}{h} \geq 0.$$

□

Now, we explicitly solve the system of $f^{p,s}$ and V :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min \{ -\lambda \mathcal{E}(z) + \mathcal{A}V(x, t, z) - \mathcal{A}f(x, t, z, x, t) + (\mathcal{A}f^{x,t})(x, t, z), \\
& \quad \Phi(x) + V_z(x, t, z) \} = 0, \\
& -\lambda e^{-\beta(t-s)} \mathcal{E}(z) + (\mathcal{A}f^{p,s})(x, t, z) = 0, \forall (x, t, z) \in \mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}}, \\
& U(p, s, t) + f_z^{p,s}(x, t, z) = 0, \forall (x, t, z) \notin \mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}}.
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}} = \left\{ (x, t, z) \in \mathcal{R} \mid \Phi(x, t) + V_z(x, t, z) > 0 \right\}.$$

Note that the operator \mathcal{A} is independent of z , we can obtain that for $(x, t, z) \in \mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}}$,

$$f^{p,s}(x, t, z) = -\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)} \mathcal{E}(z) + C^b(p, s, t, z) e^{bx} + C^l(p, s, t, z) e^{lx}$$

where $l = \frac{-\sqrt{\mu^2 + 2\beta\sigma^2} - \mu}{\sigma^2} < 0$, and $C^b(p, s, t, z), C^l(p, s, t, z)$ are functions to be determined. Then for $(x, t, z) \in \mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}}$,

$$V(x, t, z) = -\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \mathcal{E}(z) + C^b(x, t, t, z) e^{bx} + C^l(x, t, t, z) e^{lx}.$$

In view that $\mathcal{E}'(z) = -\ln(z)$, the waiting region is expected to take the form

$$\mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}} = \left\{ (x, t, z) \mid \Phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(z) + C_z^b(x, t, t, z) e^{bx} + C^l(x, t, t, z) e^{lx} > 0 \right\}.$$

We conjecture that there exists a function $\Gamma(x, t)$ such that the waiting region can be written as

$$\mathcal{W}^{\hat{\Upsilon}} = \left\{ (x, t, z) \mid z > \Gamma(x, t) \right\},$$

i.e., Γ satisfies

$$\Phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(\Gamma(x, t)) + C_z^b(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{bx} + C_z^l(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{lx} = 0.$$

Then $f^{p,s}(x, t, z)$ on the whole domain is given by

$$f^{p,s}(x, t, z) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)} [z - z \ln(z)] + C^b(p, s, t, z)e^{bx} + C^l(p, s, t, z)e^{lx}, & z > \Gamma(x, t), \\ -U^t(p, s)(z - \Gamma(x, t)) - \frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)} [\Gamma(x, t) - \Gamma(x, t) \ln(\Gamma(x, t))] \\ + C^b(p, s, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{bx} + C^l(p, s, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{lx}, & z \leq \Gamma(x, t), \end{cases}$$

and $V(x, t, z)$ on the whole domain is given by

$$V(x, t, z) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\lambda}{\beta} [z - z \ln(z)] + C^b(x, t, t, z)e^{bx} + C^l(x, t, t, z)e^{lx}, & z > \Gamma(x, t), \\ -\Phi(x)(z - \Gamma(x, t)) - \frac{\lambda}{\beta} [\Gamma(x, t) - \Gamma(x, t) \ln(\Gamma(x, t))] \\ + C^b(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{bx} + C^l(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{lx}, & z \leq \Gamma(x, t), \end{cases}$$

For V , we obtain that C^1 property w.r.t x and z are naturally satisfied, and the C^2 property w.r.t x leads to the condition that

$$[\Gamma_x(x, t)]^2 \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \frac{1}{\Gamma(x, t)} + C_{zz}^b(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{bx} + C_{zz}^l(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{lx} \right] = 0.$$

In sum, we have the following system of $\Gamma(x, t)$ and $C^b(x, t, t, z)$, $C^l(x, t, t, z)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(\Gamma(x, t)) + C_z^b(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{bx} + C_z^l(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{lx} &= 0, \\ [\Gamma_x(x, t)]^2 \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \frac{1}{\Gamma(x, t)} + C_{zz}^b(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{bx} + C_{zz}^l(x, t, t, \Gamma(x, t))e^{lx} \right] &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We shall conjecture that $\Gamma(x, t) = \Gamma(x)$, $C^b(x, t, t, z) = C^b(x, z)$, $C^l(x, t, t, z) = C^l(x, z)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(\Gamma(x)) + C_z^b(x, \Gamma(x))e^{bx} + C_z^l(x, \Gamma(x))e^{lx} &= 0, \\ [\Gamma_x(x)]^2 \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \frac{1}{\Gamma(x)} + C_{zz}^b(x, \Gamma(x))e^{bx} + C_{zz}^l(x, \Gamma(x))e^{lx} \right] &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Next we utilize the $C^{2,1,1}$ property of $f^{p,s}(x, t, z)$. The C^1 property w.r.t. z leads to that for any (p, s, t) ,

$$\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)} \ln(\Gamma(x)) + C_z^b(p, s, t, \Gamma(x))e^{bx} + C_z^l(p, s, t, \Gamma(x))e^{lx} + \Psi(p, t-s) = 0.$$

Then we conjecture that $C^b(p, s, t, z) = C^b(p, t-s, z)$, $C^l(p, s, t, z) = C^l(p, t-s, z)$ and for any $p \in \mathbb{R}$, $q = t-s \geq 0$ and any x , we have

$$\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(\Gamma(x)) + C_z^b(p, q, \Gamma(x))e^{bx} + C_z^l(p, q, \Gamma(x))e^{lx} + \Psi(p, q) = 0.$$

The C^1 property w.r.t x naturally holds under the condition of the last formula. The C^2 property w.r.t x leads to that

$$\left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \frac{1}{\Gamma(x)} + C_{zz}^b(p, q, \Gamma(x))e^{bx} + C_{zz}^l(p, q, \Gamma(x))e^{lx} \right] \Gamma'(x) + 2bC_z^b(p, q, \Gamma(x))e^{bx} + 2lC_z^l(p, q, \Gamma(x))e^{lx} = 0.$$

Putting together all we have, for any (p, q, x) , it holds

$$\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(\Gamma(x)) + C_z^b(p, q, \Gamma(x)) e^{bx} + C_z^l(p, q, \Gamma(x)) e^{lx} + \Psi(p, q) = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \frac{1}{\Gamma(x)} + C_{zz}^b(p, q, \Gamma(x)) e^{bx} + C_{zz}^l(p, q, \Gamma(x)) e^{lx} \right] \Gamma'(x) + 2bC_z^b(p, q, \Gamma(x)) e^{bx} + 2lC_z^l(p, q, \Gamma(x)) e^{lx} = 0, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\Phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(\Gamma(x)) + C_z^b(x, 0, \Gamma(x)) e^{bx} + C_z^l(x, 0, \Gamma(x)) e^{lx} = 0, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \frac{1}{\Gamma(x)} + C_{zz}^b(x, 0, \Gamma(x)) e^{bx} + C_{zz}^l(x, 0, \Gamma(x)) e^{lx} = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

We note that, unlike the fact that (4.10) reduces to (4.12) when $q = 0$ for the first order condition, (4.11) does not reduce to (4.13) for the second order condition. In fact, the combination of (4.11) and (4.13) leads to

$$bC_z^b(x, 0, \Gamma(x)) e^{bx} + lC_z^l(x, 0, \Gamma(x)) e^{lx} = 0.$$

We conjecture that either $C^b \equiv 0$ or $C^l \equiv 0$, which leads to

$$C_z^b(x, 0, \Gamma(x)) = C_z^l(x, 0, \Gamma(x)) = 0.$$

Plugging the above result into (4.12) leads to $\Phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(\Gamma(x)) = 0$, which yields

$$\Gamma(x) = e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi(x)}.$$

The boundary function Γ has the following properties.

Proposition 4.4. $\Gamma(x)$ is strictly decreasing with $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \Gamma(x) = 1$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \Gamma(x) = 0$.

Proof. The proof is straightforward as Φ is strictly increasing and $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \Phi(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \Phi(x) = \infty$. \square

Now we can obtain some boundary conditions of $f^{p,s}(x, t, z)$, which has probabilistic interpretation

$$f^{p,s}(x, t, z) = \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ \int_t^{+\infty} U(p, s, r) d\hat{\eta}_r - \lambda \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\hat{\eta}_r) dr \right\}$$

with

$$\hat{\eta}_r = z + \sup_{s \in [t, r]} (\Gamma(X_s) - z)^+,$$

$$dX_r = \mu dr + \sigma dB_r,$$

$$X_t = x.$$

First, for $z = 1$, we have $\hat{\eta}_r \equiv 1, \forall r \in [t, +\infty)$ and thus

$$f^{p,s}(x, t, 1) = -\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)} \mathcal{E}(1),$$

which leads to

$$C^b(p, q, 1) = C^l(p, q, 1) = 0, \forall (p, q) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty).$$

Second, for $x \rightarrow -\infty$, (x, t, z) must be in $(W^{\hat{\Gamma}})^c$. Then $\hat{\eta}_r \rightarrow z + (1 - z)1_{r \geq t}$, $\forall r \in [t-, +\infty)$ almost surely and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} f^{p,s}(x, t, z) = U(p, s, t)(1 - z) - \frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)} \mathcal{E}(1),$$

which leads to

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} C^l(p, q, \Gamma(x)) e^{lx} = 0, \forall (p, q) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty).$$

Third, for $x \rightarrow +\infty$, (x, t, z) must be in $W^{\hat{\Gamma}}$. Then $\hat{\eta}_r \rightarrow z$, $\forall r \in [t-, +\infty)$ almost surely and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f^{p,s}(x, t, z) = -\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)} \mathcal{E}(z),$$

which leads to

$$C^b(p, q, z) \equiv 0.$$

Combining the boundary conditions, we obtain that, for any (p, q, x) ,

$$\begin{aligned} C_z^l(p, q, \Gamma(x)) &= \left[-\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(\Gamma(x)) - \Psi(p, q) \right] e^{-lx}, \\ C^l(p, q, 1) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, for any $(p, q, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty) \times (0, 1)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} C_z^l(p, q, z) &= \left[-\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(z) - \Psi(p, q) \right] e^{-l\Gamma^{-1}(z)}, \\ C^l(p, q, 1) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $(p, q, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty) \times [0, 1]$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} C^l(p, q, z) &= - \int_z^1 \left[-\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(z') - \Psi(p, q) \right] e^{-l\Phi^{-1}(-\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(z'))} dz' \\ &= \int_z^1 \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(z') + \Psi(p, q) \right] e^{-l\Phi^{-1}(-\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(z'))} dz'. \end{aligned}$$

We can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} C^l(p, q, \Gamma(x)) e^{lx} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\int_{\Gamma(x)}^1 \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(z') + \Psi(p, q) \right] e^{-l\Gamma^{-1}(z')} dz'}{e^{-lx}} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{-\Gamma'(x) \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(\Gamma(x)) + \Psi(p, q) \right] e^{-lx}}{-l e^{-lx}} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\Gamma'(x) \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(\Gamma(x)) + \Psi(p, q) \right]}{l} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.5. *An equilibrium singular control law to the entropy regularized outer problem (4.1) is given by $\hat{\Upsilon} = (W^{\hat{\Upsilon}}, (W^{\hat{\Upsilon}})^c)$ with*

$$W^{\hat{\Upsilon}} = \{(x, t, z) \in \mathcal{R} \mid z > \Gamma(x)\}$$

and

$$\Gamma(x) = e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\Phi(x)}.$$

The generated equilibrium singular control $\hat{\eta} := \eta^{x,t,z,\hat{\Upsilon}}$ is given by

$$\hat{\eta}_r = z + \sup_{s \in [t, r]} (\Gamma(X_s) - z)^+, \forall r \in [t, +\infty).$$

The resulting equilibrium value function $V(x, t, z)$ is given by

$$V(x, t, z) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\lambda}{\beta}[z - z \ln(z)] + C^l(x, 0, z)e^{lx}, & z > \Gamma(x), \\ -\Phi(x)(z - \Gamma(x)) - \frac{\lambda}{\beta}[\Gamma(x) - \Gamma(x) \ln(\Gamma(x))] + C^l(x, 0, \Gamma(x))e^{lx}, & z \leq \Gamma(x), \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

where

$$C^l(p, q, z) = \int_z^1 \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta q} \ln(z') + \Psi(p, q) \right] e^{-l\Gamma^{-1}(z')} dz', \forall (p, q, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty) \times [0, 1].$$

Proof. To verify the equilibrium, it suffices to show that

$$\Phi(x) + V_z(x, t, z) \geq 0, \forall z > \Gamma(x), \quad (4.15)$$

$$-\lambda \mathcal{E}(z) + (\mathcal{A}f^{x,t})(x, t, z) \geq 0, \forall z \leq \Gamma(x). \quad (4.16)$$

where

$$f^{p,s}(x, t, z) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)}[z - z \ln(z)] + C^l(p, t-s, z)e^{lx}, & z > \Gamma(x), \\ -\Psi(p, t-s)(z - \Gamma(x)) - \frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)}[\Gamma(x) - \Gamma(x) \ln(\Gamma(x))] + C^l(p, t-s, \Gamma(x))e^{lx}, & z \leq \Gamma(x). \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

For (4.15), we can calculate that for $z > \Gamma(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(x) + V_z(x, t, z) \\ &= \Phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(z) + C_z^l(x, 0, z)e^{lx} \\ &= \Phi(x) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(z) - \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(z) + \Phi(x) \right] e^{l[x - \Gamma^{-1}(z)]} \\ &= \left[\frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(z) + \Phi(x) \right] [1 - e^{l[x - \Gamma^{-1}(z)]}]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$z > \Gamma(x) \Leftrightarrow \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \ln(z) + \Phi(x) > 0 \Leftrightarrow 1 - e^{l[x - \Gamma^{-1}(z)]} > 0,$$

we have

$$\Phi(x) + V_z(x, t, z) > 0, \forall z > \Gamma(x).$$

To verify (4.16), recall that for $z \leq \Gamma(x)$,

$$f^{p,s}(x, t, z) = -\Psi(p, t-s)(z - \Gamma(x)) - \frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)}[\Gamma(x) - \Gamma(x) \ln(\Gamma(x))] + C^l(p, t-s, \Gamma(x))e^{lx}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} f_t^{p,s}(x, t, z) &= -\Psi_q(p, t-s)(z - \Gamma(x)) + \lambda e^{-\beta(t-s)}[\Gamma(x) - \Gamma(x) \ln(\Gamma(x))] + C_q^l(p, t-s, \Gamma(x))e^{lx}, \\ f_x^{p,s}(x, t, z) &= lC^l(p, t-s, \Gamma(x))e^{lx} + \Gamma'(x) \left[\Psi(p, t-s) + \frac{\lambda}{\beta} e^{-\beta(t-s)} \ln(\Gamma(x)) + C_z^l(p, t-s, \Gamma(x))e^{lx} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

One can observe that $f_x^{p,s}(x, t, z)$ is independent of z , thus $f_{xx}^{p,s}(x, t, z)$ is also independent of z . Moreover, $f_t^{p,s}(x, t, z)$ is linear in z with slope $-\Psi_q(p, t-s)$. In light of the fact that

$$\left[-\lambda \mathcal{E}(z) + (\mathcal{A}f^{x,t})(x, t, z) \right] \Big|_{z=\Gamma(x)} = 0,$$

verifying (4.16) boils down to showing that

$$F(z) := -\lambda \mathcal{E}(z) + \lambda \mathcal{E}(\Gamma(x)) - \Psi_q(x, 0)(z - \Gamma(x)) \geq 0, \forall z \leq \Gamma(x). \quad (4.18)$$

Observe that

$$F'(z) = \lambda \ln(z) - \Psi_q(x, 0)$$

is increasing in z . To show (4.18), we only have to show that $F'(z)|_{z=\Gamma(x)} \leq 0$, i.e.,

$$\lambda \ln(\Gamma(x)) - \Psi_q(x, 0) \leq 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Recall that

$$\Psi(p, q) := C_a e^{ap} + e^{-\beta q} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(y, p, q) [\Phi(y) - C_a e^{ay}] dy, \forall (p, q) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty).$$

Using Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \ln(\Gamma(x)) - \Psi_q(x, 0) \\ &= -\beta \Phi(x) + \left[\beta e^{-\beta q} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(y, p, q) [\Phi(y) - C_a e^{ay}] dy \right] \Big|_{(p,q)=(x,0)} \\ & \quad - \left[e^{-\beta q} \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(y, p, q) [\Phi(y) - C_a e^{ay}] dy \right] \Big|_{(p,q)=(x,0)} \\ &= -\beta \Phi(x) + \beta [\Phi(x) - C_a e^{ax}] - \left[\mu [\Phi'(x) - a C_a e^{ax}] + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 [\Phi''(x) - a^2 C_a e^{ax}] \right] \\ &= -e^{ax} - \mu \Phi'(x) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \Phi''(x). \end{aligned}$$

The last expression is negative because Φ satisfies

$$\min\{e^{ax} - \beta \Phi(x) + \mu \Phi'(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \Phi''(x), c - \Phi'(x)\} = 0.$$

Then (4.19) holds, which completes the proof. □

Remark 5. Our proposed framework of reinforcement learning of singular control laws with entropy regularization can be extended to the general model setup with diffusion drift $\mu(x, t, y)$, volatility $\sigma(x, t, y)$, and reward function $H(x, t, y)$. But the lack of an explicit solution makes it very difficult to verify the convergence of equilibrium iteration. We leave the general case for future study.

when $\lambda = 0$, the entropy regularized outer problem (4.1) becomes

$$\min_{\eta} \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ \int_t^{+\infty} U(X_t, t, r) d\eta_r \right\} \quad (4.20)$$

which is still time-inconsistent but equivalent to the original problem (2.2). In fact, the optimal solution to the original problem (2.2) is equivalent to the pre-committed solution to (4.20), which is given by

$$\eta_r^{pre} := 1, \forall r \in [t, +\infty).$$

The above η_r^{pre} is also pre-committed for the entropy regularized outer problem (4.1) for any $\lambda > 0$ due to the non-decreasing property of entropy $\mathcal{E}(z) = z - z \log(z)$ for $z \in (0, 1]$. However, the pre-committed solution involves no exploration and we therefore use the equilibrium solution to explore the environment and approximate the optimal solution of the original problem.

Remark 6. Due to the non-convergence as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, one cannot use the learned outer value function V (or equivalently f) to approximate the value function Φ of the original problem even when λ is close to 0. In our current model setup, the existence of an explicit equilibrium and value function makes it possible to parameterize Φ , U , and V (or f) using the same set of parameters. As a consequence, we can learn the value function Φ in the original problem without entropy regularization by learning V (or f) or U in the entropy regularized problem. However, the general case without explicit solution is more challenging, which will be left for future study.

5 Actor-Critic RL using the Two-Stage Formulation

In this section, we design a type of actor-critic reinforcement learning algorithm using the randomized singular control laws under entropy regularization. In each step, the agent first evaluates all functions needed, then iterates the strategy, and finally uses the new strategy to generate an action.

5.1 Policy evaluation

Two functions play important roles in our algorithm design. The first one is $\Phi(x) = U(x, t, t) = \Psi(x, 0), \forall t$, which represents the optimal value function of the original problem. In each step, when the strategy of the inner problem is Ξ , the agent should evaluate $\Phi(x; \bar{x}) := \Phi(x; \Xi_{\bar{x}})$ where

$$\Phi(x; \Xi) := \Phi(x, t, y; \Xi) := \mathbb{E}_{x,t,y} \left\{ \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-t)} e^{aX_r^\Xi} dr + \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-t)} c d\xi_r^\Xi \right\}, \forall (x, t, y) \in \mathcal{Q} \quad (5.1)$$

with $(X^\Xi, \xi^\Xi) := (X^{x,t,y,\Xi}, \xi^{x,t,y,\Xi})$ being the state and control generated by Ξ at (x, t, y) .

The function $\Phi(x; \Xi)$ can be evaluated using the following martingale characterization.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Ξ be an admissible singular control law for the inner problem, and $\Phi(x; \Xi)$ is a given function. Then $\Phi(x; \Xi)$ is the value function of Ξ in the sense of (5.1) if and only if the process*

$$M^\Phi := \left\{ M_r^\Phi := e^{-\beta(r-t)} \Phi(X_r^\Xi; \Xi) + \int_t^r e^{-\beta(r'-t)} e^{aX_{r'}^\Xi} dr' + \int_t^r e^{-\beta(r'-t)} c d\xi_{r'}^\Xi \right\}$$

is an $\{\mathcal{F}_r\}_{r \in [t, +\infty)}$ -martingale.

By the definition of U , we have $U(x, t, r) = \Phi(x, t, y; \Xi^{*,r})$ where $\Xi^{*,r}$ is defined by $W^{\Xi^{*,r}} = \{(x, t, y) | t < r \text{ or } (x, t, y) \in W^{\Xi^*}\}$. Therefore, the function U can also be evaluated using Theorem 5.1.

The second one is $V(x, t, z) = f^{x,t}(x, t, z)$, which represents the equilibrium value function of the outer problem, and it can approximate the original problem's optimal value function with sufficiently small λ . In each step, when the strategy of the outer problem is Υ , the agent should evaluate $f^{p,s}(x, t, z; \Upsilon)$, which is defined by

$$f^{p,s}(x, t, z; \Upsilon) := \mathbb{E}_{x,t,z} \left\{ \int_t^{+\infty} U(p, s, r) d\eta_r^\Upsilon - \lambda \int_t^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(r-s)} \mathcal{E}(\eta_r^\Upsilon) dr \right\}$$

with $\eta^\Upsilon = \eta^{x,t,z,\Upsilon}$ being the auxiliary singular control generated by Υ at (x, t, z) . The martingale characterization of $f^{p,s}(x, t, z; \Upsilon)$ is given in the next result.

Theorem 5.2. *Let Υ be an admissible auxiliary singular control law and $f^{p,s}(x, t, z; \Upsilon)$ be a given function. Then $f^{p,s}(x, t, z; \Upsilon)$ is the value function of Υ if and only if the process*

$$M^{f,p,s} := \left\{ M_r^{f,p,s} := f^{p,s}(X_r, r, \eta_r^\Upsilon, \Upsilon) + \int_t^r U(p, s, r') d\eta_{r'}^\Upsilon - \lambda \int_t^r e^{-\beta(r'-s)} \mathcal{E}(\eta_{r'}^\Upsilon) dr' \right\}$$

is an $\{\mathcal{F}_r\}_{r \in [t, +\infty)}$ -martingale.

Observe that we have the explicit expressions for all $\Phi(x)$, $U(p, s, t)$ and $f^{p,s}(x, t, z)$, which motivate us to consider a shared set of parameters for all of them such that any one of these functions can be exploited in the step of policy evaluation to update their common parameters and hence update all parameterized functions simultaneously.

5.2 Policy iteration

Note that we are handling a pair of singular control laws (Ξ, Υ) . For Ξ , there exists a policy iteration scheme $\Xi \rightarrow \Xi'$ given by

$$W^{\Xi'} := \text{int}(\{x | q_0^\Phi(x; \Xi) \geq 0, q_1^\Phi(x; \Xi) \leq 0\}). \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} q_0^\Phi(x; \Xi) &:= c - \Phi'(x; \Xi), \\ q_1^\Phi(x; \Xi) &:= e^{ax} - \beta\Phi(x; \Xi) + \mu\Phi'(x; \Xi) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\Phi''(x; \Xi). \end{aligned}$$

The intuition for the policy iteration is that the optimal $\hat{\Xi}$ satisfies

$$W^{\hat{\Xi}} = \{x | q_0^\Phi(x; \hat{\Xi}) > 0\} = \{x | q_1^\Phi(x; \hat{\Xi}) > 0\}.$$

For arbitrary Ξ , the last equality in the above formula may not hold, and the iteration is aimed at correcting the difference between the two sets.

For the outer problem, the equilibrium $\hat{\Upsilon}$ can also be interpreted as the boundary between two regions, and we can define a similar iteration scheme of the regions. However, it is well-known that the iteration of equilibrium towards the fixed point may not converge in general unless one can verify some contraction mapping property of the iteration operation.

From an alternative perspective, $\hat{\Upsilon}$ is given by

$$W^{\hat{\Upsilon}} = \{(x, z) | z > e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi(x; \hat{\Xi})}\}$$

which is a feedback form of $\hat{\Xi}$. Therefore, we can iterate $\Upsilon \rightarrow \Upsilon'$ by

$$W^{\Upsilon'} := \{(x, z) | z > e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi(x; \Xi')}\}$$

with Ξ' given by (5.2).

Consequently, the overall policy iteration is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\Xi, \Upsilon) &\rightarrow (\Xi', \Upsilon'), \\ W^{\Xi'} &:= \text{int}(\{x | q_0^\Phi(x; \Xi) \geq 0, q_1^\Phi(x; \Xi) \leq 0\}), \\ W^{\Upsilon'} &:= \{(x, z) | z > e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi(x; \Xi')}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Our previous paper Liang et al. [2025] has shown the convergence of Ξ^n towards $\hat{\Xi}$. Hence Υ^n converges to $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ with $W^{\tilde{\Upsilon}} := \{(x, z) | z > e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi(x; \hat{\Xi})}\}$. Then $\tilde{\Upsilon} = \hat{\Upsilon}$ and we can conclude that the policy iteration converges to the equilibrium pair $(\hat{\Xi}, \hat{\Upsilon})$.

Remark 7. There is no need to implement a separate policy iteration for the outer problem. The outer problem is actually learning a mapping from the inner value function $\Phi(x, \bar{x})$, which is fed into the variational inequality of the outer problem, to the boundary of the outer control law $\Gamma(x) = e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi(x, \bar{x})}$. The mapping involves no unknown parameter, thus there is no need to learn it. Due to the time-inconsistency and other factors, it can also be difficult to prove a converging policy iteration for an arbitrary initial Γ_0 .

Remark 8. The iteration of Υ is equivalent to the iteration of the inner value function Φ . Therefore, the new reinforcement learning algorithm with randomized singular control has a complexity no greater than the non-randomized problem. But the randomization encourages exploration and is expected to be more robust in the convergence of the learned strategy.

Based on the above policy iteration scheme, we can also avoid PE for the outer problem and just focus on Φ as our learned value function. In this way, the randomization just affects the sampling in online learning to perform more robustly, without raising any computational complexity or causing non-convergence of the entropy regularized value function. The new algorithm differs from the non-randomized algorithm in that the agent flips a biased coin before acting; other than that, the possible behavior is the same as the non-randomized algorithm. The randomization is best in the sense that the expected overall entropy regularized value function achieves the minimum in an equilibrium sense.

6 RL Algorithms and Numerical Implementations

In this section, we numerically implement the reinforcement learning algorithm in the simulation experiment.

In the first step, we design a uniform parameterization for the value functions to prepare for policy evaluation.

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1 &= a, \\ \theta_2 &= b, \\ \theta_3 &= C_a. \end{aligned}$$

We do policy evaluation on U for the randomized approach, while on Φ for the non-randomized approach. These two functions are parameterized as follows.

$$\Phi^\theta(x; \bar{x}) = \begin{cases} \theta_3 e^{\theta_1 x} + C_b(\theta; \bar{x}) e^{\theta_2 x}, & x \leq \bar{x}, \\ c(x - \bar{x}) + C_v(\theta; \bar{x}), & x > \bar{x}, \end{cases},$$

$$U^\theta(x, t, r; \bar{x}) = \begin{cases} \theta_3 e^{\theta_1 x} + e^{-\beta(r-t)} \int_{-\infty}^{\bar{x}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2(\theta)(r-t)}} e^{-\frac{[y-x-\mu(\theta)(r-t)]^2}{2\sigma^2(\theta)(r-t)}} C_b(\theta; \bar{x}) e^{\theta_2 y} dy \\ + e^{-\beta(r-t)} \int_{\bar{x}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2(\theta)(r-t)}} e^{-\frac{[y-x-\mu(\theta)(r-t)]^2}{2\sigma^2(\theta)(r-t)}} [c(y - \bar{x}) + C_v(\theta; \bar{x}) - \theta_3 e^{\theta_1 y}] dy, & t \in [0, r), \\ \begin{cases} \theta_3 e^{\theta_1 x} + C_b(\theta; \bar{x}) e^{\theta_2 x}, & x \leq \bar{x}, \\ c(x - \bar{x}) + C_v(\theta; \bar{x}), & x > \bar{x}, \end{cases} & t \in [r, +\infty) \end{cases}$$

where

$$C_b(\theta; \bar{x}) := \frac{c - \theta_1 \theta_3 e^{\theta_1 \bar{x}}}{\theta_2 e^{\theta_2 \bar{x}}}, \quad C_v(\theta; \bar{x}) := \frac{c + (\theta_2 - \theta_1) \theta_3 e^{\theta_1 \bar{x}}}{\theta_2},$$

$$\mu(\theta) = \frac{\beta(\theta_2^2 - \theta_1^2) - \frac{\theta_2^2}{\theta_3}}{\theta_1 \theta_2 (\theta_2 - \theta_1)}, \quad \sigma(\theta) = \sqrt{\frac{2[\frac{\theta_2}{\theta_3} - \beta(\theta_2 - \theta_1)]}{\theta_1 \theta_2 (\theta_2 - \theta_1)}}.$$

Remark 9. It is not appropriate to parameterize Φ using the expression of the optimizer, which does not depend on the given boundary \bar{x} but is additionally C^2 at the boundary. The boundary in this parameterization is a fixed point for the policy iteration scheme. It is common to do the policy iteration in an appropriate subset of admissible strategies, and it may result in faster convergence. The parameterization should fit the structure of the value function for this subset of admissible strategies. In an extreme case, the parameterization fits the singleton of the optimal case, and the policy iteration no longer leads to different strategies and is thus not appropriate.

Remark 10. The parameterization for the singular control is different from the regular control in that the parameterized value function also depends on the current boundary \bar{x} .

For the policy evaluation, we use the offline martingale loss algorithm for both U and Φ . To tackle the infinite-time horizon, we impose a truncation at a sufficiently large terminal time T . Noting the fact that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-\beta T} U(X_T^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}, r}, T, r; \bar{x}) = 0, a.s.,$$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-\beta T} \Phi(X_T^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}}; \bar{x}) = 0, a.s..$$

We can approximate the above terms to zero and obtain the following policy evaluation scheme to iterate θ for Φ .

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha l(m) \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left[-e^{-\beta t_n} \Phi^\theta(X_{t_n}^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}}; \bar{x}) + \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} H_k \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \Phi^\theta(X_{t_n}^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}}; \bar{x}), \quad (6.1)$$

where α is the initial learning rate, $l(\cdot)$ is the learning rate schedule function, and H_k is the running cost at step k with interpretation $H_k = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} e^{-\beta r} e^{aX_r^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}}} dr$.

The policy evaluation for U is similar but more complex. In the randomized singular control approach, we have an activation time $\tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}$ generated by the auxiliary singular control law $\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$ with

$W^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} := \{(x, z) | z > e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi^\theta(x; \bar{x})}\}$. In the algorithm, suppose the grids are $t_n = T \frac{n}{N}, n = 0, 1, \dots, N$, then

$$\eta_{t_n}^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} = \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi^\theta(X_{t_k}; \bar{x})}$$

where X is the simulated uncontrolled state process. And $\tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}$ can be determined by

$$\tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} = \inf\{t_k, 1 \leq k \leq N | \eta_{t_k}^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \geq Z\}, \quad Z \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]. \quad (6.2)$$

to make the total probability of activation before time t_k be $\eta_{t_k}^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}$ for any k .

If the infimum in (6.2) exists, we iterate

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha l(m) \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left[-e^{-\beta t_n} U^\theta(X_{t_n}^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}, \tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}}, t_n, \tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}; \bar{x}) + \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} [H_k + c_k] \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} U^\theta(X_{t_n}^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}, \tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}}, t_n, \tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}; \bar{x}), \quad (6.3)$$

where c_k is the control cost at step k with interpretation $c_k = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}-} c d\xi_r^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}, \tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}}$.

For the case that the infimum in (6.2) does not exist, we approximate this case by the case that $\tau^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} = +\infty$. Now the value function is just the uncontrolled value function

$$U^\infty(x, t; \bar{x}) := C_a e^{ax}, \quad \text{and} \quad U^{\infty, \theta}(x, t) := \theta_3 e^{\theta_1 x}$$

and we iterate

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha l(m) \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left[-e^{-\beta t_n} U^{\infty, \theta}(X_{t_n}, t_n) + \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} H_k \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} U^{\infty, \theta}(X_{t_n}, t_n). \quad (6.4)$$

Algorithm 1 Non-randomized environment simulator

INPUT: Grids $\{t_n\}_{0 \leq n \leq N}$, initial $(X_{t_0-}, t_0, \xi_{t_0-})$, and strategy $\Xi_{\bar{x}}$.

for $n = 0, 2, \dots, N-1$ **do**

 Calculate immediate jump $\Delta \xi_{t_n} = (X_{t_n-} - \bar{x})^+$ and set $\xi_{t_n} = \xi_{t_n-} + \Delta \xi_{t_n}$, $X_{t_n} = X_{t_n-} - \Delta \xi_{t_n}$.

 Simulate an uncontrolled increase $I_{\Delta t} \sim N(\mu \Delta t, \sigma^2 \Delta t)$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{t_{n+1}-} &= \xi_{t_n} + (X_{t_n} + I_{\Delta t} - \bar{x})^+, \\ X_{t_{n+1}-} &= X_{t_n} - (X_{t_n} + I_{\Delta t} - \bar{x})^+. \end{aligned}$$

 Calculate the approximated running cost and control cost

$$\begin{aligned} H_{t_n} &= e^{-\beta t_n} e^{a X_{t_n}} \Delta t, \\ c_{t_n} &= e^{-\beta t_n} c(X_{t_n} + I_{\Delta t} - \bar{x})^+. \end{aligned}$$

end for

return The sequences of (t_n) -triples $\{(X_{t_n}, t_n, \xi_{t_n})\}_{1 \leq n \leq N-1}$, $(t_{n+1}-)$ -triples $\{(X_{t_{n+1}-}, t_{n+1}, \xi_{t_{n+1}-})\}_{1 \leq n \leq N-1}$, running costs $\{H_{t_n}\}_{1 \leq n \leq N-1}$ and control costs $\{c_{t_n}\}_{1 \leq n \leq N-1}$.

Algorithm 2 Randomized environment simulator

INPUT: Grids $\{t_n\}_{0 \leq n \leq N}$, initial $(X_{t_0-}, t_0, \xi_{t_0-}, \eta_{t_0-})$, and strategy $(\Xi_{\bar{x}}, \Upsilon_{\bar{x}})$.

Initialize activating time $\tau = \infty$, sample a random variable $Z \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$.

for $n = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ **do**

 Calculate immediate auxiliary jump $\Delta\eta_{t_n} = (e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\Phi^\theta(X_{t_n-}; \bar{x})} - \eta_{t_n-})^+$. Set $t_{n+1} = t_n + \Delta t$ and

$$\eta_{t_{n+1}-} = \eta_{t_n} = \eta_{t_n-} + \Delta\eta_{t_n}.$$

if $\tau = \infty$ **then**

if $\eta_{t_n} > Z$ **then**

 Set activation time $\tau = t_n$.

else

 Set $\xi_{t_{n+1}-} = \xi_{t_n} = \xi_{t_n-}$, $X_{t_n} = X_{t_n-}$. Simulate an uncontrolled increase $I_{\Delta t} \sim N(\mu\Delta t, \sigma^2\Delta t)$ in $[t_n, t_{n+1})$ and set $X_{t_{n+1}-} = X_{t_n} + I_{\Delta t}$.

 Calculate approximate running cost $H_{t_n} = e^{-\beta t_n} e^{aX_{t_n}} \Delta t$ and control cost $c_{t_n} = 0$.

end if

end if

if $\tau < \infty$ **then**

 Feed $(X_{t_n-}, t_n, \xi_{t_n-})$ and $\Xi_{\bar{x}}$ into the environment simulator 1 to obtain the current jumped triple $(X_{t_n}, t_n, \xi_{t_n})$, next beforetime triple $(X_{t_{n+1}-}, t_{n+1}, \xi_{t_{n+1}-})$, running cost H_{t_n} and control cost c_{t_n} .

end if

end for

return The activating time τ , the sequences of (t_n) -quadruples $\{(X_{t_n}, t_n, \xi_{t_n}, \eta_{t_n})\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$, $(t_{n+1}-)$ -quadruples $\{(X_{t_{n+1}-}, t_{n+1}, \xi_{t_{n+1}-}, \eta_{t_{n+1}-})\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$, running costs $\{H_{t_n}\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$ and control costs $\{c_{t_n}\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$.

The environment simulators for generating samples for offline policy evaluation are summarized in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2. Algorithm 1 is for the non-randomized setting, while Algorithm 2 is for the randomized setting. Specifically, for each small interval $[t_n, t_{n+1})$, the non-randomized simulator generates the singular control and state process at $(X_{t_n-}, t_n, \xi_{t_n-})$ under $\Xi_{\bar{x}}$. On the other hand, the randomized simulator acts in two steps. First, it calculates whether the agent should activate at time t_n according to a random variable Z . Second, if the agent should activate at t_n , then the simulator generates the singular control and state process at $(X_{t_n-}, t_n, \xi_{t_n-})$ under $\Xi_{\bar{x}}$; otherwise, the simulator keeps the control ξ constant and generate the state process according to the uncontrolled dynamics. The running cost and control cost in (t_n, t_{n+1}) , which are expressed as integrals in (t_n, t_{n+1}) , are approximated by the values of integrands at t_n multiplied by Δt or $(\xi_{t_{n+1}-} - \xi_{t_n})$.

Remark 11. For the randomized approach, an alternative choice is to learn f instead of U . The iteration by the martingality w.r.t f is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} & \left[- (f^{x_0, 0})^\theta(X_{t_n}, t_n, \eta_{t_n}) + \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} U^\theta(x_0, 0, \eta_{t_n}) \Delta\eta_{t_n} - \lambda \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} e^{-\beta t_n} \mathcal{E}(\eta_{t_n}) \Delta t \right] \\ & \cdot \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (f^{x_0, 0})^\theta(X_{t_n}, t_n, \eta_{t_n}) - \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} U^\theta(x_0, 0, \eta_{t_n}) \Delta\eta_{t_n} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

However, the above formula requires parameterizations of both U and f , and we don't choose it for simplicity.

We highlight the following facts regarding the policy evaluation:

(i) In each step, the jump provides no information because c is known. Hence, we only apply PE in each (t_n, t_{n+1}) interval in (6.1) and (6.3)~(6.4).

(ii) The summation of gradient term in (6.1) and (6.3)~(6.4) over n can be extremely large due to the cumulation effect. We impose a gradient clipping with a bound M_{gc} on the summation term.

(iii) The parameters θ are assumed by the agent to satisfy conditions $\mu(\theta) > 0$, $\sigma(\theta) > 0$ and $\beta - \mu(\theta)\theta_1 - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(\theta)\theta_1^2 > 0$ (The assumption $\mu(\theta) > 0$ can be generalized, see Remark 12). Equivalently, it is assumed to be satisfied that

$$\theta_1 > 0, \quad \theta_3 > \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad \theta_2 \in \left(\sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}}} \theta_1, \frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}} \theta_1 \right).$$

Note that (6.4) only iterates θ_1 and θ_3 , we impose boundary clipping for θ_1 and θ_3 and separately iterate θ_2 , i.e.,

$$\theta_1 \leftarrow \max\{\theta_1, \delta_{bc}\}, \tag{6.5}$$

$$\theta_3 \leftarrow \max\{\theta_3, \frac{1}{\beta} + \delta_{bc}\}, \tag{6.6}$$

$$\theta_2 \leftarrow \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}}} + \frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}}}{2} \theta_1. \tag{6.7}$$

Remark 12. The relation $\theta_2 > \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}}} \theta_1$ follows from the assumption that $\mu(\theta) > 0$, which is for simplicity and faster convergence. More generally, we may assume the unknown μ to have a lower bound and derive similar relations. The assumption $\mu > 0$ here is just for simplicity. Even if μ is assumed to have no known lower bound, the agent can use the clipping $\theta_2 \in (-\infty, \frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}} \theta_1)$ and

subjectively design a rule to replace the updating rule $\theta_2 \leftarrow \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}}} + \frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}}}{2} \theta_1$.

For the other case, we only do boundary clipping

$$\theta_1 \leftarrow \max\{\theta_1, \delta_{bc}\}, \tag{6.8}$$

$$\theta_3 \leftarrow \max\{\theta_3, \frac{1}{\beta} + \delta_{bc}\}, \tag{6.9}$$

$$\theta_2 \leftarrow \min \left\{ \frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}} \theta_1 - \delta_{bc}, \max \left\{ \theta_2, \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \frac{1}{\theta_3}}} \theta_1 + \delta_{bc} \right\} \right\}. \tag{6.10}$$

The next step is to implement the policy iteration. Recall that the policy for the outer problem can be directly calculated via

$$W^{\Upsilon^{\bar{x}}} = \{(x, z) \mid z > e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi(x; \bar{x})}\},$$

we only have to iterate the inner policy presented by \bar{x} . To avoid additional evaluation error that may influence the overall comparison results, we just use $\mu(\theta)$ and $\sigma(\theta)$ to directly evaluate the q-functions, with additionally parameterizing the q-functions and evaluating the new parameters.

Using the proof of Proposition 4.1 in Liang et al. [2025], the policy iteration $\bar{x} \rightarrow \bar{x}'$ can be implemented in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Policy iteration for \bar{x}

INPUT: Current parameters θ , current boundary \bar{x} , boundary iteration rate α_{pi} .

if $(\theta_2 - \theta_1)\theta_1\theta_3e^{\theta_1\bar{x}} - c\theta_2 \leq 0$ **then**

Calculate \bar{x}' as the root of

$$e^{\theta_1 x} - \beta c(x - \bar{x}) - \beta \frac{c + (\theta_2 - \theta_1)\theta_3 e^{\theta_1 \bar{x}}}{\theta_2} + \mu(\theta)c = 0$$

w.r.t variable x in $[\bar{x}, +\infty)$.

else

Calculate \bar{x}' as the root of

$$c - \theta_1\theta_3e^{\theta_1 x} - ce^{\theta_2(x-\bar{x})} + \theta_1\theta_3e^{\theta_2 x - (\theta_2 - \theta_1)\bar{x}} = 0$$

w.r.t variable x in $(-\infty, \bar{x})$.

end if

Scale the change by letting

$$\bar{x}' \leftarrow \bar{x} + \alpha_{pi}(\bar{x}' - \bar{x}).$$

return the updated boundary \bar{x}'

Now we can integrate the policy evaluation and the policy iteration to design some actor-critic reinforcement learning algorithms. The algorithms are offline because we are using martingale loss algorithms for policy evaluation. The benchmark algorithm using non-randomized singular control is shown in Algorithm 4. Accordingly, the algorithm using randomized singular control is shown in Algorithm 5.

Algorithm 4 benchmark non-randomized offline actor-critic algorithm

INPUT: Initial x_0 , a cut-off terminal time $T > 0$, number of episodes M , number of mesh grids N , proper parameterization $\Phi^\theta(\cdot; \cdot)$, initial learning rates α and a learning rate schedule function $l(\cdot)$. Gradient clipping bound M_{gc} , boundary clipping threshold δ_{gc} and boundary iteration rate α_{pi} .

Initialize θ by a guessed vector value, and initialize boundary \bar{x} by a guessed value. Obtain time step size $\Delta t := \frac{T}{N}$ and $t_n := n\frac{T}{N}$ for $n = 0, 1, \dots, n$.

for episode $m = 1, 2, \dots, M$ **do**

Feed grids $\{t_n\}_{0 \leq n \leq N}$, initial $(X_{t_0-}, t_0, \xi_{t_0-}) = (x_0, 0, 0)$, and strategy $\Xi_{\bar{x}}$ defined by $W^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}} = \{x | x < \bar{x}\}$ into the non-randomized environment simulator 1 to obtain the sequences of current jumped triples $\{(X_{t_n}, t_n, \xi_{t_n})\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$, next beforetime triples $\{(X_{t_{n+1}-}, t_{n+1}, \xi_{t_{n+1}-})\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$, running costs $\{H_{t_n}\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$ and control costs $\{c_{t_n}\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$.

Apply the martingale loss algorithm to update the parameter θ by (6.1) with gradient clipping in $[-M_{gc}, M_{gc}]$. Then apply boundary clipping (6.8)~(6.10) to adjust the updated parameters.

Apply policy iteration 3 to update $\bar{x} \leftarrow \bar{x}'$.

end for

Algorithm 5 Randomized offline actor-critic algorithm

INPUT: Initial x_0 , a cut-off terminal time $T > 0$, number of episodes M , number of mesh grids N , proper parameterization $U^\theta(\cdot, \cdot, \tau; \cdot)$ for any τ and $U^{\infty, \theta}(\cdot, \cdot; \cdot)$ for $\tau = \infty$, initial learning rates α and a learning rate schedule function $l(\cdot)$. Gradient clipping bound M_{gc} , boundary clipping threshold δ_{gc} and boundary iteration rate α_{pi} . Temperature λ .

Initialize θ by a guessed vector value, and initialize boundary \bar{x} by a guessed value. Obtain time step size $\Delta t := \frac{T}{N}$ and $t_n := n \frac{T}{N}$ for $n = 0, 1, \dots, n$.

for episode $m = 1, 2, \dots, M$ **do**

Feed grids $\{t_n\}_{0 \leq n \leq N}$, initial $(X_{t_0-}, t_0, \xi_{t_0-}, \eta_{t_0-}) = (x_0, 0, 0, 0)$, and strategy $(\Xi_{\bar{x}}, \Upsilon_{\bar{x}})$ defined by $W^{\Xi_{\bar{x}}} = \{x | x < \bar{x}\}$ and $W^{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} = \{z | z > e^{-\frac{\beta}{\lambda} \Phi^\theta(x; \bar{x})}\}$ into the randomized environment simulator 2 to obtain the activating time τ , the sequences of current jumped quadruples $\{(X_{t_n}, t_n, \xi_{t_n}, \eta_{t_n})\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$, next beforetime quadruples $\{(X_{t_{n+1}-}, t_{n+1}, \xi_{t_{n+1}-}, \eta_{t_{n+1}-})\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$, running costs $\{H_{t_n}\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$ and control costs $\{c_{t_n}\}_{0 \leq n \leq N-1}$.

if activation time $\tau < \infty$ **then**

Apply the martingale loss algorithm to update θ by (6.3) with gradient clipping in $[-M_{gc}, M_{gc}]$. Then apply boundary clipping (6.8)~(6.10) to adjust the updated parameters.

else

Apply the martingale loss algorithm to update θ by (6.4) with gradient clipping in $[-M_{gc}, M_{gc}]$. Then apply boundary clipping (6.5)~(6.7) to adjust the updated parameters.

end if

Apply policy iteration 3 to update $\bar{x} \leftarrow \bar{x}'$.

end for

In our numerical experiment, the true model coefficients are set as $c = 1$, $\beta = 0.1$, $a = 0.1$, $\mu = 0.25$, $\sigma = 1$. We choose the truncation time $T = 100$, time step $\Delta t = 0.02$ and train $M = 500$ episodes with initial guess parameters $\theta_1^{guess} = 0.15$, $\theta_2^{guess} = 0.4$, $\theta_3^{guess} = 15$, initial guess boundary $\bar{x}^{guess} = -2.5$ and initial state $x_0 = 1$. The initial learning rates are $[0.1, 0.1, 1]$ for $\theta_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, and the learning rate schedule functions are all $l(m) := 1.01^{-m}$ for $\theta_i, i = 1, 2, 3$. The boundary iteration rate is $\alpha_{pi} = 0.5$, the gradient clipping bounds are $M_{gc} = [1, 1, 10]$ for the summation of gradient terms for $\theta_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, and the boundary clipping threshold is $\delta_{bc} = 0.001$.




Figure 1: Comparison of learned parameters $\theta_i, i = 1, 2, 3$ of non-randomized Algorithm 4 and randomized Algorithm 5 versus the true parameters during episodes of training.




Figure 2: Left panel: comparison of learned optimal boundary \bar{x} of non-randomized Algorithm 4 and randomized Algorithm 5 versus the true optimal boundary during episodes of training. Right panel: comparison of L^∞ error of learned value function $\Phi(x; \bar{x})$ of non-randomized Algorithm 4 and randomized Algorithm 5 during episodes of training.

The numerical results of Algorithm 4 and Algorithm 5 with temperature parameter $\lambda = 0.5$ are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2. Figure 1 plots the iteration convergence of learned $\theta_i, i = 1, 2, 3$ using the non-randomized Algorithm 4 and the randomized Algorithm 5, respectively, versus the true values of $\theta_i, i = 1, 2, 3$. Figure 2 illustrates the learned optimal boundary \bar{x} and the L^∞ error of the learned value function $\Phi(x; \bar{x})$ using the non-randomized Algorithm 4 and the randomized Algorithm 5, respectively. Here, the L^∞ error is numerically approximated by the L^∞ error of $\Phi(x; \bar{x})$ for $x \in [-100, 100]$. Comparing the iteration convergence of parameters and the L^∞ errors, we observe that the randomized Algorithm 5 performs better than the non-randomized Algorithm 4, particularly, the exploration by considering the randomized singular control laws clearly improves the accuracy in learning all parameters.

Acknowledgements: Zongxia Liang is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant no. 12271290. Xiang Yu is supported by the Hong Kong RGC General Research Fund (GRF) under grant no. 15211524, the Hong Kong Polytechnic University research grant under no. P0045654 and the Research Centre for Quantitative Finance at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University under grant no. P0042708.

References

- L. Bo, Y. Huang, and X. Yu. On optimal tracking portfolio in incomplete markets: The reinforcement learning approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 63(1):321–348, 2025.
- J. Cao, D. Li, V. R. Young, and B. Zou. Equilibrium strategies for singular dividend control problems under the mean-variance criterion. *Preprint, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.08433>*, 2025.
- M. Dai, Y. Dong, and Y. Jia. Learning equilibrium mean-variance strategy. *Mathematical Finance*, 33(4): 1166–1212, 2023a.
- M. Dai, Y. Dong, Y. Jia, and X. Y. Zhou. Learning merton’s strategies in an incomplete market: Recursive entropy regularization and biased gaussian exploration. *Preprint, available at [arXiv:2312.11797](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11797)*, 2023b.

- M. Dai, Y. Jia, and H. Jin. Dynamic mean-variance portfolio selection with transaction costs. *Preprint*, available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4958481>, 2024a.
- M. Dai, Y. Sun, Z. Q. Xu, and X. Y. Zhou. Learning to optimally stop diffusion processes, with financial applications. *Preprint*, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.09242>, 2024b.
- J. Dianetti, G. Ferrari, and R. Xu. Exploratory optimal stopping: A singular control formulation. *Preprint*, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.09335>, 2024.
- J. Dianetti, R. Dumitrescu, G. Ferrari, and R. Xu. Entropy regularization in mean-field games of optimal stopping. *Preprint*, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.18821>, 2025.
- Y. Dong. Randomized optimal stopping problem in continuous time and reinforcement learning algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 62(3):1590–1614, 2024.
- Y. Jia. Continuous-time risk-sensitive reinforcement learning via quadratic variation penalty. *Preprint*, available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4800185>, 2024.
- Y. Jia and X. Y. Zhou. Policy evaluation and temporal-difference learning in continuous time and space: A martingale approach. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(154):1–55, 2022a.
- Y. Jia and X. Y. Zhou. Policy gradient and actor-critic learning in continuous time and space: Theory and algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(275):1–50, 2022b.
- Y. Jia and X. Y. Zhou. q-learning in continuous time. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(161):1–61, 2023.
- I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. Connections between optimal stopping and singular stochastic control i. monotone follower problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 22(6):856–877, 1984.
- I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. Connections between optimal stopping and singular stochastic control ii. reflected follower problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 23(3):433–451, 1985.
- N. E. Karoui and I. Karatzas. A new approach to the skorohod problem, and its applications. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 34(1-2):57–82, 1991.
- Z. Liang and X. Luo. Stackelberg reinsurance and premium decisions with mv criterion and irreversibility. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 16(1):167–199, 2025.
- Z. Liang, X. Luo, and F. Yuan. Equilibria for time-inconsistent singular control problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 62(6):3213–3238, 2024.
- Z. Liang, X. Luo, and X. Yu. A reinforcement learning framework for some singular stochastic control problems. *Preprint*, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.22203>, 2025.
- B. Wang, X. Gao, and L. Li. Reinforcement learning for continuous-time optimal execution: Actor-critic algorithm and error analysis. *Finance and Stochastics*, forthcoming, 2025.
- H. Wang and X. Y. Zhou. Continuous-time mean-variance portfolio selection: A reinforcement learning framework. *Mathematical Finance*, 30(4):1273–1308, 2020.
- H. Wang, T. Zariphopoulou, and X. Y. Zhou. Reinforcement learning in continuous time and space: A stochastic control approach. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(198):1–34, 2020.
- X. Wei and X. Yu. Continuous-time q-learning for mean-field control problems. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 91:10, 2025.
- X. Wei, X. Yu, and F. Yuan. Unified continuous-time q-learning for mean-field game and mean-field control problems. *Preprint*, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.04521>, 2024.